

क्रमांक 1417-ज(I)-77/25317.—पूर्वी पंजाब युद्ध पुरस्कार अधिनियम, 1948 (जैसा कि उसे हरियाणा राज्य में अपनाया गया है और उस में आज तक संशोधन किया गया है) की धारा 2(ए)(1) तथा 3(1) के अनुसार सौंपे गये अधिकारों का प्रयोग करते हुए हरियाणा के राज्यपाल श्री दुर्जन सिंह, पुत्र श्री निहाल सिंह, गांव हलका (मध्यधारी), तहसील व जिला भिवानी को खरीफ, 1965 से रबी, 1970 तक 100 रुपये वार्षिक तथा खरीफ, 1970 से 150 रुपये वार्षिक कीमत वाली युद्ध जागीर सनद में दी गई शर्तों के अनुसार सहर्ष प्रदान करते हैं।

क्रमांक 702-ज(I)-77/25321.—पूर्वी पंजाब युद्ध पुरस्कार अधिनियम, 1948 (जैसा कि उसे हरियाणा राज्य में अपनाया गया है और उस में आज तक संशोधन किया गया है) की धारा 2(ए)(1) तथा 3(1) के अनुसार सौंपे गए अधिकारों का प्रयोग करते हुए हरियाणा के राज्यपाल श्री रघुनाथ सिंह, पुत्र श्री ग्योजी सिंह, गांव खेड़ी तलवाना, तहसील व जिला महेन्द्रगढ़ को रबी, 1969 से रबी, 1970 तक 100 रुपये वार्षिक तथा खरीफ, 1970 से 150 रुपये वार्षिक कीमत वाली युद्ध जागीर सनद में दी गई शर्तों के अनुसार सहर्ष प्रदान करते हैं।

क्रमांक 1638-ज(I)-77/25325.—पूर्वी पंजाब युद्ध पुरस्कार अधिनियम, 1948 (जैसा कि उसे हरियाणा राज्य में अपनाया गया है और उस में आज तक संशोधन किया गया है) की धारा 2(ए)(1) तथा 3(1) के अनुसार सौंपे गये अधिकारों का प्रयोग करते हुए हरियाणा के राज्यपाल श्री मन्त सिंह, पुत्र श्री सुन्दर सिंह, मकान नं० 99, प्रेम नगर, अम्बाला शहर को रबी, 1973 से 150 रुपये वार्षिक कीमत वाली युद्ध जागीर सनद में दी गई शर्तों के अनुसार सहर्ष प्रदान करते हैं।

क्रमांक 1573-ज(I)-77/25329.—श्री गोविन्द सिंह, पुत्र श्री अन सिंह, गांव मुहसडा, तहसील लोहार, जिला भिवानी, को दिनांक 28 दिसम्बर, 1976, को हुई मृत्यु के परिणामस्वरूप हरियाणा के राज्यपाल पूर्वी पंजाब युद्ध पुरस्कार अधिनियम, 1948 (जैसा कि उसे हरियाणा राज्य में अपनाया गया है और उस में आज तक संशोधन किया गया है) की धारा 4 एवं 2(ए)(1) तथा 3(1) के अधीन प्रदान की गई शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए सहर्ष आदेश देते हैं, कि श्री गोविन्द सिंह को मब्लिग 150 रु० वार्षिक की जागीर जो उसे हरियाणा सरकार की अधिसूचना क्रमांक 1726-ज(I)-76/28226, दिनांक 9 सितम्बर, 1976, द्वारा मंजूर की गई थी, अब उसकी विधवा श्रीमती अन्तरबाई के नाम खरीफ, 1977 से 150 रु० वार्षिक की दर से सनद में दी गई शर्तों के अन्तर्गत तबदील की जाती है।

क्रमांक 1635-ज(I)-77/25333.—पूर्वी पंजाब युद्ध पुरस्कार अधिनियम, 1948 (जैसा कि उसे हरियाणा राज्य में अपनाया गया है और उस में आज तक संशोधन किया गया है) की धारा 2(ए)(1) तथा 3(1) के अनुसार सौंपे गये अधिकारों का प्रयोग करते हुए हरियाणा के राज्यपाल श्री सेवा सिंह, पुत्र श्री जेठा सिंह, गांव हवेली, तहसील नारायणगढ़, जिला अम्बाला, को रबी, 1973 से 150 रुपये वार्षिक कीमत वाली युद्ध जागीर सनद में दी गई शर्तों के अनुसार सहर्ष प्रदान करते हैं।

यशवन्त कुमार जैन,

विशेष कार्य अधिकारी, हरियाणा सरकार,
राजस्व विभाग।

LABOUR DEPARTMENT

The 28th September, 1977

No. 10224-4Lab-77/26079. —In pursuance of the provisions of section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (Act No. XIV of 1947), the Governor of Haryana, is pleased to publish the following award of the Presiding Officer, Industrial Tribunal, Haryana Faridabad, in respect of the dispute between the workman and the management of M/s Kelvinator of India, Ltd., Faridabad.

BEFORE SHRI NATHU RAM SHARMA, PRESIDING OFFICER, INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL, HARYANA, FARIDABAD

Reference No. 66 of 1976

between

SHRI KRISHAN LAL, WORKMAN AND THE MANAGEMENT OF M/S KELVINATOR OF INDIA LTD., FARIDABAD

Presents:

Shri Bhim Singh Yadav, for the workman.

Shri Jaswant Singh, for the management.

AWARD

By order No. ID/FD/57-J-75/8429, dated 1st March, 1976, the Governor of Haryana, referred the following dispute between the management of M/s Kelvinator of India Ltd., Faridabad and its workman Shri Krishan Lal to this Tribunal, for adjudication in exercise of the powers conferred by clause (d) of sub-section (1) of section 10 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 :—

Whether the dismissal of Shri Krishan Lal was justified and in order? If not, to what relief is he entitled?

On receipt of the reference, notices were issued to the parties. The parties appeared and put in their pleadings. On the pleadings of the parties, the following issues were framed on 10th November, 1976 :—

- (1) Whether the dismissal of Shri Krishan Lal workman concerned as justified and in order? If not, to what relief is he entitled?
- (2) Whether the reference is invalid on the ground that the demand notice was simultaneously forwarded to the Conciliation Officer and that the management could not have time to decide the demand?
- (3) Whether the domestic enquiry is proper, not vitiated and the findings of the enquiry is in accordance with principles of natural justice?

The case was fixed for the evidence of the management. The management examined one Shri Satish Kumar Btra, Stenographer, Personnel Department of the management who stated that the Factory Manager had considered the enquiry proceedings and findings and thereupon issued dismissal order Ex. M-1. He identified the signatures of the Factory Manager on that order and proved other documents Ex. M-2 to M-6. In cross-examination he stated that these documents do not bear his signatures. The management then examined the enquiry officer Shri J. L. Agnihotri who held the domestic enquiry. He proved letter of appointment Ex. M-7. He stated that he gave all opportunities to the workman concerned of cross-examining the witness and the workman had signed each page of the enquiry proceedings and carbon copies of enquiry proceedings have been handed over to him. He stated that he recorded the enquiry proceedings correctly. He considered the proceedings and found the workman concerned guilty and then made his report. His report is Ex. M-9. In cross-examination he stated that he did not give in writing to the workman concerned that he was appointed enquiry officer. He stated that he did not remember whether the workman was present on all sittings. In cross-examination, he stated that he had held the enquiry quite in accordance with the principal of natural justice.

The workman examined himself as W. W. 1 who stated that he attended all the proceedings on all dates. He stated that the management did not give him facility for defence. He further stated that whatever he spoke and requested that was not recorded by the enquiry officer. He also stated that he had produced his witness in defence and he had given his own statement. In cross-examination he stated that he did not give in writing to the enquiry officer that whatever he spoke or requested was not recorded. He further stated that he gave his complaint in writing but the enquiry officer did not receive it and thus complaints were in his possession which he could not produce then and there but could produce latter on. The workman closed there case. Then the case was fixed for arguments. Arguments were heard.

I have gone through the enquiry proceedings. Each page of the enquiry proceedings is signed by the workman concerned. He was present on all dates of hearing. The management had examined in that enquiry three witnesses named Shri B. S. Vig, Assistant Personnel Officer as M. W. 1, Shri Rijinder Singh, Suptd. Main Assembly as M. W. 2, Shri Radha Ballab, Time Keeper as M. W. 3. The workman examined Shri Chandi Ram a worker in the main Assembly as DW-1, Shri Roop Chand of the same Department as DW-2 and gave his own statement in writing and deposed that he had nothing to add to his written statement. The workman has examined all the witnesses of the management. He has been given full opportunity of defence. I do not find any fault in the domestic enquiry. Principles of Natural Justice have nowhere suffered. I, therefore, hold that the enquiry is proper. The enquiry officer found him guilty of the charge levelled against the workman concerned and thereupon the management dismissed him. I am unable to interfere with the findings of the enquiry officer. As I have found the enquiry proper, I give my award as follows:—

That the dismissal of Shri Krishan Lal was justified and in order. He is not entitled to any relief.

NATHU RAM SHARMA,

Dated 9th September, 1977,

Presiding Officer,
Industrial Tribunal, Haryana,
Faridabad.

No. 878, dated the 19th September, 1977.

Forwarded (four copies) to the Secretary to Government, Haryana, Labour and Employment Departments, Chandigarh, as required under section 15 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947.

Dated the 9th September, 1977.

NATHU RAM SHARMA,
Presiding Officer,
Industrial Tribunal, Haryana,
Faridabad.

The 30th September, 1977

No 9690-4Lab-77/26346—In pursuance of the provisions of section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (Act No. XIV of 1947), the Governor of Haryana, is pleased to publish the following award of the Presiding Officer, Labour Court, Rohtak in respect of the dispute between the workman and the management of M/s Dalmia Dadri Cement Ltd., Charkhi Dadri.

BEFORE SHRI O.P. SHARMA, PRESIDING OFFICER, LABOUR COURT, HARYANA,
ROHTAK

Reference No. 5 of 1974

between

SHRI PREM KUMAR PANDOVE AND THE MANAGEMENT OF M/S. DALMIA DADRI
CEMENT LTD., CHARKHI DADRI

Present, —

Shri Bhim Sain, for the workman.
Shri S.N. Bhandari for the management.

AWARD

The facts leading to this reference under clause (c) of sub-section (i) of section 10 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947, as made out from the record, may briefly be stated as under.

Shri Prem Kumar Pandove, workman concerned was in the service of M/s. Dalmia Dadri Cement Ltd Charkhi Dadri as a Clerk in the Sales Office since 1970. Before that he was working as a Clerk of the Company in the quarries run by it. He allegedly proceeded on leave for 2½ days on the afternoon of 29th September, 1972 and was required to report for duty on the morning of 2nd October, 1972. According to him, he was taken ill at Panipat where he had gone to spend the above leave and from there he wrote an application for extension of leave from 2nd October, 1972 to 8th October, 1972 accompanied by a medical certificate. It has further been stated that he reported for duty on the expiry of the extended period of leave applied for and actually worked in the office for an hour or so on 9th October, 1972 which being his rest day, he was asked by the Sales Superintendent to come on the following day. He was, however, not allowed to join his duty on 10th October, 1972. He continued coming to the office till 22nd October, 1972 to resume his duty but without success. He then wrote a letter to the management through Dalmia Dadri Cement Factory Men's Union on 23rd October, 1972 to which the reply was sent by the latter on 28th October, 1972 (Exhibit W.1) on record informing that since Shri Prem Kumar Pandove had remained absent from duty for more than 8 days without any proper authorisation, his name had been struck off the rolls as per the Standing Orders of the Company applicable to him. On the same day, he gave the demand notice, whereupon conciliation proceedings were started which, however, ended in failure.

On receipt of the failure report from the Conciliation Officer, the Governor of Haryana referred the dispute for adjudication to this court,—vide order No. ID/NSR/1-N-73/1557-61, dated 18th January, 1974 with the following term of reference :—

"Whether the termination of services of Shri Prem Kumar Pandove was justified and in order? If not, to what relief is he entitled?"

Usual notices were given to the parties and they put in their respective pleadings. The workman reiterated his claim for reinstatement and payment of back wages as earlier raised through the demand notice, dated 28th October, 1972, stating his case in detail as discussed above. According to him, his leave for 2½ days from 29th September, 1972 (afternoon) to 1st October, 1972 on account of some urgent domestic work at Panipat had been duly sanctioned by the Sales Superintendent Shri Ram Chander Srivastava, that while at Panipat he had been taken ill and had applied for extension of his leave from 2nd October, 1972 to 8th October, 1972, and advised by the Medical Practitioner Shri Om Pharkash Phacca, and the medical certificate issued by him was sent along with the leave application. He has then referred to his working in the office for an hour on the morning of 9th October, 1972 and the direction of Sales Superintendent to come on the following day as that was his weekly rest, refusal

of the management to allow him to resume his duty on 10th of October, 1972 and thereafter, the letter dated 23rd October, 1972 written by the Union and the reply received from the management dated 28th October, 1972. It has further been stated that the allegation of the management that he had remained absent from duty without any proper leave or authority was false and baseless and as such he was entitled to reinstatement with continuity of his previous service and payment of full back wages.

The management, on the other hand, has controverted the above allegations of the workman. It has not been admitted that any leave for 2½ days from 29th September, 1972 (afternoon) till 1st October, 1972 had been sanctioned. It has further been denied that he had sent an application for the extension of his leave from 2nd October 1972 to 8th October, 1972 on medical ground and also the fact that he had actually performed any duty on 9th October 1972. According to the management, he had taken 2 days leave from 22nd September, 1972 and 23rd September, 1972 and subsequently a telegram had been received from him for the extension of his leave till 27th September, 1972 which was allowed but after attending his duty on 28th September, 1972 he had absented himself from 29th September, 1972 onwards without any proper leave or permission and his name had, therefore, to be struck off the rolls according to the Certified Standing Orders of the Company of which necessary intimation was given to him. Still another plea has been raised on behalf of the management that the term of reference as embodied in the order is at variance with the demand in question in as much as the management never terminated the services of this workman and there was no material before the Government to formulate any opinion about the existence of an industrial dispute between the parties and, therefore, the order of reference itself was bad in law.

From the pleadings of the parties the following two issues arose for determination in the case.

- (1) Whether the order of reference is bad in law for reasons given in the preliminary objection of the statement of the management ?
- (2) Whether the termination of services of Shri Prem Kumar Pandove was justified and in order ? If not, to what relief is he entitled ?

Shri Prem Kumar Pandove besides himself coming into the witness-box as W.W. 1 has examined four more witnesses including the Medical Practitioner Shri Om Parkash Phacca W.W. 2, Shri Lakhi Ram, Tally Checker, Packing Department of the Company W.W. 3, Shri K. S. Aggarwal, Sales Superintendent W.W. 4 and Shri Bhim Sain, President, Dalmia Dadri Cement Factory Men's Union W.W. 5. The documentary evidence relied upon by him consists of letter, dated 28th October, 1972 of the management Exhibit W. 1 referred to above, medical certificate, dated 2nd October, 1972 Exhibit W.W. 1/1 certificate of posting, dated 2nd October, 1972, Exhibit W.W. 1/2, monthly freight statement for September, 1972, Exhibit W.W. 1/3, entry in the attendance register Exhibit W.W. 4/1, Wagon allotment sheet Exhibit W.W. 4/2, entry in the outgoing register of the Clerks maintained at the time office gate Exhibit W.W. 4/3, letter dated 26th October, 1973 of the Joint Labour Commissioner, Haryana addressed to the Factory Manager in regard to the demand notice, dated 28th October, 1972 of the workman Exhibit W.W. 5/1, letter dated 6th November, 1974 addressed by the workman to the Labour Commissioner, Haryana Exhibit W.W. 5/2 and reply to the said letter Exhibit W.W. 5/3.

The management has examined only one witness Shri S. K. Sharma, Joint-Secretary-cum-Factory Manager of the Company M.W. 1 and placed reliance upon documents, namely, extract of the relevant entry pertaining to Shri Prem Kumar Pandove in the attendance register Exhibit M. 1, letter, dated 2nd November, 1972, written to him in reply to his demand notice, dated 28th October, 1972 Exhibit M. 2, copy of the telegram of Shri Prem Kumar Pandove sent from Chandigarh asking for four days leave Exhibit M. 3, leave application on the prescribed form for 22nd September, 1972 and 23rd September, 1972 Exhibit M. 4 and copy of the Certified Standing Orders of the Company Exhibit M. 5 [relevant clause being 9(3).]

The case has been fully argued on both sides and I have given a very careful thought to the material on record, oral as well as documentary.

The issues involved in the case as stated above are more or less interdependent and may conveniently be taken up together. The question which is of vital importance and arises for determination in the case is whether Shri Prem Kumar Pandove, workman concerned had remained absent from duty, without any proper authorisation and had consequently lost his lien on the job held by him, as per clause 9(3) of the Certified Standing Orders of the Company which are applicable to him. If the answer to this primary question involved in the case is in the affirmative he would naturally be out of court and it being clearly a case of self-abandonment of service by him the provisions of section 2-A of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 would not be attracted to the facts of the case and the reference itself, in the result, would be bad in law and without jurisdiction. The whole case has, therefore, to be judged keeping in view the above propositions which involve questions both of law and act.

As already observed, the case for the management is that the present workman had remained absent from duty from 29th September, 1972 onwards for more than 8 days consecutively and his name had, therefore, to be struck off the rolls in accordance with clause 9(3) of the Certified Standing Orders of the Company which

are applicable to him. There is no denying the fact that this Company has the Certified Standing Orders wherein clause 9(3) exists and provides as under :—

"If the workman remains absent beyond the period of leave originally granted or subsequently extended, he shall lose his lien on his appointment unless he (a) returns within 8 days of the expiry of the leave; and (b) explain to the satisfaction of the Manager his inability to return before the expiry of his leave. In case the workman loses his lien on his appointment, he shall be entitled to be kept on the (Baddi) list".

It would thus appear that if a workman absents himself from duty for 9 days or more continuously, without any leave or proper authority, he is deemed to have left the service of the Company and his above conduct results into the loss of lien on the job held by him unless he gives satisfactory explanation of his absence to the management within the prescribed period. In the instant case, it is common ground between the parties that Shri Prem Kumar Pandove, workman concerned was not on duty from 29th September 1972 to 8th October, 1972 according to him from the afternoon on 29th September, 1972 and according to the management he had remained absent for the whole day on 29th September, 1972. The case of the workman is that, as a matter of fact, he had obtained leave for 2½ days from 29th September, 1972 (afternoon) till 1st October, 1972. This has been denied by the management. He has further contended that he had gone to Panipat where he was taken ill on 1st October, 1972 and he had sent an application for extension of his leave from 2nd October, 1972 to 8th October, 1972 accompanied by the medical certificate from Shri Om Parkash Phacca Vaid W.W. 2. This has also been disputed on behalf of the management. In the circumstances, the burden was heavy upon the workman concerned to establish from cogent and convincing evidence that he had actually been on leave duly sanctioned by the management for the period in question. But after very carefully scrutinising the entire evidence on record, oral as well as documentary, I am constrained to observe that he has failed to discharge this burden. No leave application for the first 2½ days and the alleged request in writing for extension of the leave from 2nd October, 1972 to 8th October, 1972 have been brought on record nor copies thereof. The management has candidly admitted that this workman had applied for leave for 22nd September, 1972 and 23rd September, 1972 which was duly sanctioned and the leave application on the prescribed form Exhibit M. 4 has also been placed on record. The workman had applied for the extension of this leave till 27th September, 1972 telegraphically from Chandigarh which was also allowed and the copy of the telegram is on record as Exhibit M. 3. If Shri Prem Kumar Pandove had actually applied for further leave for 2½ days from 29th September, 1972 (afternoon) and the same had been sanctioned obviously there was no reason for the management to conceal this fact. There is no allegation of any *mala fides* on the part of the management against him or any consideration of victimisation due to any trade union activity. The demand notice as well as the statement of claim filled in the present reference are quite silent on this point. The case might have been different if there was any satisfactory evidence that the management was displeased with him for one reason or the other but there is no such allegation by the workman in the instant case what to speak of any evidence on the point.

In the attendance register he has been marked absent from 29th September, 1972 till 9th October, 1972, i.e., for more than 8 days. Nothing worth consideration has been brought on record to indicate that the entries in the attendance register are false or that the same have been forged by making any subsequent alterations or interpolations. Much stress has been laid on behalf of the workman on the evidence of the private Medical Practitioner Shri Om Parkash Phacca W.W. 2 and the certificate Exhibit W.W.1/1 alleged to have been issued by him. He has not produced any corroborative evidence, patients register etc., to support the above contention of the workman concerned regarding his illness. His statement shows that he had issued only one certificate to Shri Prem Kumar Pandove which has been produced by him in the case as Exhibit W.W.1/1. It has not been shown as to which was the other certificate that is alleged to have been sent to the management along with the application for the extension of the leave from 2nd October, 1972 to 8th October, 1972. It is not safe to rely upon the type of evidence produced by the workman in the present case to prove his illness during the period in question. It is not believable that Shri Om Parkash Phacca W.W. 2 who claims to be a Registered Medical Practitioner would not maintain records of the patients treated by him, and for that matter, duplicate copies of the medical certificates issued to the patients. Moreover, the mere making of the leave application or request for the extension of the leave already granted by itself is not sufficient to justify the absence from duty of a workman. He is further required to prove that the leave asked for had been actually sanctioned. It has further been contended on behalf of the workman that he had actually worked for an hour or so on the morning of 9th October, 1972 when he had been asked by the Sales Superintendent to come on the following day since 9th October, 1972, was his weekly rest. This aspect of the case which has been specifically denied on behalf of the management also appears to be made up story. He has examined Shri K. S. Aggarwal, Sales Superintendent W.W. 4 who has categorically denied this fact. According to the workman, Shri Ram Chander Srivastava had asked him on 9th September, 1972 to come on the following day. Strongly enough he has not been examined as witness in the case and instead Shri K. S. Aggarwal W.W. 4 has been examined who has not supported him on the point. My attention has further been drawn to the statement of W.W. 3 Shri Laxhi Ram who has deposed that he had seen Shri Prem Kumar Pandove, the present workman, working in the office on the morning of 9th October, 1972. Shri Laxhi Ram was working as a Clerk in the Packing Department inside the factory and he was required to make an entry in the out going register, if he had to go to the Sales Office which is outside the factory gate. The out-going register Exhibit W.W. 4/3 does not show any such entry to corroborate his statement that he had actually gone to the Sales Office on that day and at the particular

time. Otherwise also, the statement of Shri Prem Kumar Pandove that he had been asked by the then Sales Superintendent Shri Ram Chander Srivastava to go home and come for duty on the next day since 9th October, 1972 was his weekly rest does not sound to reason. He had been absent from duty for more than 8 days and would have tried to work for the whole day on 9th October, 1972. No evidence has been led by him to show that he had initialled or signed the attendance register on that day. It has been stated that the register was not available. There was no question of the attendance register being not available if the office was open on that day and he had actually worked for sometime. So, taking into consideration all the facts and the circumstances of the case it appears to me that it is all an after-thought and a made up story.

In any case, the fact remains that this workman had remained absent from duty for more than 8 days consecutively, without any proper authorisation, and that being so, his services automatically stood terminated by his own conduct, resulting into the loss of lien held by him on the job, without any action on the part of the management. In other words, it was a case of self-abandonment of service by the workman himself for reasons better known to him and from the perusal of the demand notice leading to the present reference also his case appears to be one of loss of lien, as intimated to him by the management, and as such it is not covered by the provisions of section 2-A of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947, which relate to cases of dismissal, discharge, termination or retrenchment of services. The learned representative of the workman has not been able to satisfy me to the contrary.

So, on the facts established in the case and for the reasons aforesaid, I am of the considered view that it is a case of loss of lien on the job by the workman due to his own conduct by remaining absent from duty for more than 8 days consecutively, without any proper authorisation, and his services automatically stood terminated by virtue of the provision as laid down in clause 9(3) of the Certified Standing Orders of the Company by which he was governed. In the circumstances, no industrial dispute existed between the parties which could validly be referred for adjudication. Otherwise, also the workman concerned has no good case to challenge the validity of the termination of his services. Both the issues are, therefore, decided against him holding that the reference itself is bad in law for the reasons discussed above and the workman concerned is not entitled to any relief by way of reinstatement or payment of back dues. The award is made accordingly but without any order as to costs.

O. P. SHARMA,

Dated the 10th January, 1975.

Presiding Officer,
Labour Court, Haryana, Rohtak.

No. 158, dated 18th January, 1975.

Forwarded (four copies) to the Secretary to Government of Haryana, Labour and Employment Departments, Chandigarh, as required under section 15 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947.

O. P. SHARMA,

Presiding Officer,
Labour Court, Haryana, Rohtak.

The 11th October, 1977

No. 10542-4Lab-77/27258.—In pursuance of the provisions of section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (Act No. XIV of 1947), the Governor of Haryana is pleased to publish the following award of the Presiding Officer, Industrial Tribunal, Haryana, Faridabad, in respect of the dispute between the workmen and the management of M/s Somany Filkington's Ltd., Kassar, Bahadurgarh.

BEFORE SHRI NATHU RAM SHARMA, PRESIDING OFFICER, INDUSTRIAL
TRIBUNAL, HARYANA, FARIDABAD

Application No. 14 of 1977 under section 33-A of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947

between

SHRI DORA SINGH, WORKMAN AND THE MANAGEMENT OF M/S SOMANY
FILKINGTON'S LTD., KASSAR, BAHADURGARH

Present—

Shri Rajinder Singh Dahyia, for the workman.

Shri Sudhir Chadha, for the management.

AWARD

On receipt of the complaint, notice was issued to the respondent. The respondent appeared and filed written statement. The case was fixed for filing rejoinder by the complainant. Today the representative for the complainant appeared and withdrew the complaint stating that he would take step to raise a regular dispute. The complaint is, therefore, dismissed as withdrawn. The parties to bear their own costs.

Dated the 15th September, 1977.

NATHU RAM SHARMA,

Presiding Officer,
Industrial Tribunal, Haryana,
Faridabad.

No. 936, dated 27th September, 1977.

Forwarded (four copies) to the Secretary to Government, Haryana, Labour and Employment Departments, Chandigarh, as required under section 15 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947.

Dated the 27th September, 1977.

NATHU RAM SHARMA,

Presiding Officer,
Industrial Tribunal, Haryana,
Faridabad.

No. 10547-4Lab-77 27260. -In pursuance of the provisions of section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (Act No. XIV of 1947), the Governor of Haryana is pleased to publish the following award of the Presiding Officer, Industrial Tribunal, Haryana, Faridabad, in respect of the dispute between the workman and the management of M/s Somany Pilkington's Ltd., Kassar, Bahadurgarh.

BEFORE SHRI NATHU RAM SHARMA, PRESIDING OFFICER, INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL,
HARYANA, FARIDABAD

Application No. 11 of 1977 under section 33-A of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947

between

SHRI ARJUN PARSAD WORKMAN AND THE MANAGEMENT OF M/S SOMANY
PILKINGTON'S LTD., KASSAR, BAHADURGARH

Present :

Shri Rajinder Singh Dahyia, for the workman.

Shri Sudhir Chadha, for the management.

AWARD

On receipt of the complaint, notice was issued to the respondent. The respondent appeared and filed written statement. The case was fixed for filing rejoinder by the complainant. Today the representative for the complainant appeared and withdrew the complaint stating that he would take step to raise a regular dispute. The complaint is, therefore, dismissed as withdrawn. The parties to bear their own costs.

Dated the 15th September, 1977.

NATHU RAM SHARMA,
Presiding Officer,
Industrial Tribunal, Haryana,
Faridabad.

No. 930, dated the 27th September, 1977.

Forwarded (four copies) to the Secretary to Government, Haryana, Labour and Employment Departments, Chandigarh, as required under section 15 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947.

Dated the 27th September, 1977.

NATHU RAM SHARMA,
Presiding Officer,
Industrial Tribunal, Haryana,
Faridabad.